REMARKS

Claims 27 and 38-81 were pending in the instant application. Claims 27, 38-59, and 79 have been amended. New claims 82-85 have been added herein. Support for new claims 82-85 can be found throughout the specification and claims as filed. Specifically, support for new claim 82 can be found in the specification as filed at least at page 21, lines 25-28. Support for new claim 83 can be found in the specification as filed at least in Examples 1 and 2. Support for new claim 84 can be found in the specification as filed at least at page 2, lines 15-20, page 21, lines 25-28, and Examples 1 and 2. Support for new claim 85 can be found in the specification as filed at least at page 3, lines 13-19, page 21, lines 25-28, and Examples 1 and 2. Upon entry of the present Amendment, claims 27 and 38-85 are pending and presented for reconsideration. Applicants respectfully submit that no new matter is introduced by the present Amendment.

In a Response to Restriction Requirement earlier filed on March 22, 2006, Applicants elected Group I, drawn to claims 27, 38-59, 79, and 81, without traverse. Applicants further elected the species of Type II diabetes, for search purposes only. It is the Applicants' understanding that under 35 U.S.C. §121, an election of a single species for prosecution on the merits is required, to which the claims will be restricted if no generic claim is finally held allowable. Applicants further understand that upon the allowance of a generic claim, they will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 C.F.R.§1.141 *et seq.*

Amendment and/or cancellation of the claims is not to be construed as acquiescence to any of the objections/rejections set forth in the instant Office Action or any previous Office Action of the parent application, and was done solely to expedite prosecution of the application. Applicants submit that claims were not added or amended during the prosecution of the instant application for reasons related to patentability. Applicants reserve the right to pursue the claims, as originally filed, or similar claims in this or one or more subsequent patent applications.

Comment

The Examiner states in the Office Action, on page 2, that the "Applicant may wish to substitute 'adipocyte' for 'cell' in claim 27 items (c) and (d), and in claim 79, items (c) and (d)." Applicant has amended the claims as appropriate to comply with the Examiner's helpful comment.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §112

Rejection of claims 52-55 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

Claims 52-55 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. In particular, the Office Action states, on page 3, that "claim 52 is indefinite because the metes and bounds of 'siRNA derivative' are unclear. It is unclear what is considered to be a 'derivative' and what is not." Furthermore, the Office Action states that "[c]laims 53-55 are indefinite because claim 53 recites 'the siRNA derivative' without antecedent basis. These claims are also indefinite because they require 'increased' or 'decreased' stability or activity, but they set no standard against one may compare."

The term 'siRNA derivative' has a clear and definite meaning both in the art and in Applicants' specification. For example, the specification teaches, on page 23, lines 13-15, that "[a]n siRNA derivative is a modified siRNA," and that "[m]odifications include, without limitation, crosslinking or blocking of a 3'terminus." The specification also teaches that "[t]he nucleic acid compositions of the invention include both unmodified siRNAs and modified siRNAs as known in the art, such as crosslinked siRNA derivatives (see page 16, lines 23-24). The specification goes on to further describe such siRNA derivates on page 16, line 25, through page 18, line 4. Thus, Applicants submit that the use of the term 'siRNA derivative' is clear.

However, without acquiescing to this rejection and solely in an effort to further prosecution, Applicants have amended claim 52 to recite an siRNA comprising at least one deoxyribonucleotide or nucleotide analog. Moreover, Applicants have amended claims 53-55 to refer to an siRNA comprising at least one deoxyribonucleotide or nucleotide analog that has increased or reduced stability relative to an siRNA lacking the at least one deoxyribonucleotide or nucleotide analog. Support for the amendment can be found, for example, at page 9 line 9 through page 10, line 5 of the specification. In view of the above, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claims 52-55 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, and favorable reconsideration.

Rejection of claims 27, 38-59, 79, and 81 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, First Paragraph

Claims 27, 38-59, 79, and 81 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for the methods *in vitro*, does not reasonably provide enablement for such methods performed *in vivo* . In particular, the Office Action states,

on page 4, that the specification "provides no guidance as to how to perform the method *in vivo*, in particular how to measure glucose uptake or GLUT4 translocation *in vivo*. The prior art of record provides no guidance in this regard, and such an assay was not routinely performed in the art at the time of the invention." The Office Action further states that this "rejection could be overcome by requiring that the recited adipocytes must be 'isolated'."

Without acquiescing to this rejection and solely in an effort to further prosecution, Applicants have amended claims 27, 38-59, 79, and 81 to refer to "contacting ***in vitro*** an adipocyte having a cell membrane." Applicants, therefore, respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claims 52-55 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, and favorable reconsideration.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §102

Rejection of claims 38-42 and 45 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a)

The Examiner has rejected claims 38-42 and 45 as being anticipated by Jiang *et al.* (Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. USA 100(13):7569-7574, 2003). The Examiner relies on Jiang *et al.* for teaching "a method in which the function of Akt1 and Akt2 in glucose uptake in adipocytes was studied by siRNA inhibition." On page 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner has also noted that "this rejection may be overcome by an affidavit or declaration by applicant alone indicating that applicant is the sole inventor and that the others were merely working under his or her direction."

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested. Applicant submits herewith declarations under 37 CFR §1.132 which indicate that Kerri A. Coleman, My Chouinard, and Queta Boese, who are co-authors with the inventors in the Jiang *et al.* (June 2003) paper, are *not* co-inventors of the subject matter described and claimed in the instant application. As indicated in the declaration, Kerri A. Coleman was an undergraduate student in the inventors' lab who performed technical aspects described in the above-referenced paper under the inventors' direction and supervision. My Chouinard was a technician in the lab who performed technical aspects described in the above-referenced paper under the inventors' direction and supervision. Queta Boese was a technician at Dharmacon where the siRNA was synthesized according to the inventors' instructions for the above-referenced paper and did not otherwise contribute to the work described in this publication.

Accordingly, the Jiang *et al.* (June 2003) article represents Applicants' own work, published within the year before the effective filing of the present application, and cannot be used against Applicant under 35 U.S.C.§ 102(a). *In re Katz*, 687 F.2d 450, 215 USPQ 14 (CCPA 1958).

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 38-42 and 45 under 102(a) be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103

Rejection of claims 27, 44-48, 50, 51, 53-59, 79, and 81 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Examiner has rejected claims 27, 44-48, 50, 51, 53-59, 79, and 81 as being unpatentable over Al-Hasani *et al.* (J. Bio. Chem. 273(28):17504-17510, 1998) in view of Clancy *et al.* (US 20030087259). The Examiner states on page 6 of the Office Action that, "Al-Hasani taught methods of studying genes related to glucose transport. Specifically, Al-Hasani investigated the relationship between the GTPase dynamin and endocytosis of the GLUT4 glucose transporter in cultured rat adipocytes." The Examiner admits that, "Al-Hasani did not teach the use of siRNA." The Examiner then states that "Clancy taught that the activity of a polypeptide in a cell can be controlled by several alternative means including the use of negative mutants of the protein and the use of antisense or siRNA directed at the mRNA encoding the protein." In conclusion, the Office Action states, on page 7, that, "it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use siRNA directed against dynamin to assess its role in the endocytosis of GLUT4."

Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's assertion that the claimed invention would have been obvious to the skilled artisan at the time it was made. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, it is necessary for the Examiner to present evidence that one having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teachings in the applied references in the proposed manner to arrive at the claimed invention. See, e.g., *Carella v. Starlight Archery*, 804 F.2d 135, 231 USPQ 644 (Fed. Cir. 1986); and *Ashland Oil, Inc. v. Delta Resins and Refractories, Inc.*, 776 F.2d 281, 227 USPQ 657 (Fed. Cir. 1985). Moreover, when a combination of references are used to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, the Examiner must present evidence, preferably in the form of some teaching, suggestion, incentive or inference in the applied references, or in the form of generally available

knowledge, that one having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make the claimed invention and would have had a reasonable expectation of success in making the claimed invention. Under section 103, "[b]oth the suggestion and the expectation of success must be founded in the prior art, not in applicant's disclosure" (*Amgen, Inc. v. Chugai Pharmaceutical Co., Ltd.* 927 F.2d 1200, 1207, 18 USPQ2d 1016 (Fed. Cir. 1991), quoting *In re Dow Chemical Co.,* 837 F.2d 469, 473, 5 USPQ2d 1529, 1531 (Fed Cir. 1988)).

Applicants submit that the Examiner has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness since the skilled artisan would have found neither the motivaton nor a reasonable expectation of success at arriving at the claimed invention given the teachings of the cited references.

The claims are directed to a method of identifying a gene that affects glucose transport, or a method of identifying a gene involved in an insulin response disease or disorder, the methods comprising: (a) contacting *in vitro* an adipocyte having a cell membrane with an siRNA targeted against the gene, thereby forming a mixture; (b) electroporating the mixture under conditions such that the cell membrane becomes permeablized and the siRNA is introduced into the adipocyte; (c) culturing the adipocyte under conditions suitable for expression of the targeted gene and such that the siRNA mediates RNAi; and (d) assaying glucose transport in the adipocyte, wherein a modulation in glucose transport indicates that the targeted gene affects glucose transport; thereby identifying a gene that affects glucose transport or a gene that is involved in an insulin response disease or disorder.

Al-Hasani *et al.* describe the characterization of the mechanism of GLUT4 endocytosis by overexpressing a dominant-negative mutant of dynamin-1 in rat adipose cells (see page 17504, column 2, lines 46-48 of Al-Hasani *et al.*). In order to study the role of dynamin in GLUT4 endocytosis, Al-Hasani *et al.* overexpress a plasmid encoding a dominant-negative mutant of dynamin-1 in isolated rat adipose cells. The effects of dynamin-1 on GLUT4 trafficking are monitored using a co-transfected recombinant GLUT4 containing a hemaglutinin (HA) tag. The methodology of Al-Hasani is designed to transfect adipose cells with ***DNA and DNA expression plasmids*** (see, *e.g.,* page 17505, column 1, second paragraph of Al-Hasani *et al.*). In particular, the methods involve transfection of cells with large amounts of ***plasmid DNA*** (*e.g.*, 5 μg plasmid DNA per transfection). Large amounts of carrier DNA are utilized (*e.g.*, 100μg carrier DNA). Pulse conditions are specified for the described ***plasmid DNA*** transfection. The reference is silent as to capacitance.

Clancy *et al.* teach diagnostic assays for detecting bone and cartilage formation and threapeutic methods for treating disease and disorders related to bone and cartilage formation or respoption. Clancy *et al.* teach siRNAs as a component of a composition comprising "a plurality of antagonists of a plurality of genes" (see *e.g.*, para. [0009]). Clancy *et al.* also teach siRNAs as potential agents for "blocking or reducing the expression of a gene or the activity or level of the encoded polypetide that is modulated, *e.g.*, upregulated, during normal bone or cartilage formation" (see *e.g.*, para. 0239)).

Applicants respectfully submit that the ordinary artisan would not have been motivated to combine the teachings of the Al-Hasani *et al.* (J. Bio. Chem. 273(28):17504-17510, 1998) with those of Clancy *et al.* (US 20030087259) to arrive at Applicants claimed methodology. Even if the skiled artisan were to rely on Clancy *et al.* for teaching that siRNAs as an agent capable of blocking gene expression, he would not have been motivated to substitute the ***DNA plasmids*** transfected in Al-Hasani with such siRNAs. The mere fact that Clancey *et al.* lists siRNAs and dominant negative mutants as potential gene blocking compounds in a more extensive list of gene blocking compounds, e.g., antisense molecules, ribozymes, triplexes, aptamers, does not arise to the level of a motivation to select one specific member from the recited antagonist list for use in the featured methodology. Moreover, there is nothing in Clancey et al. which would motivate a skilled artisan to combine the teachings with those of Al-Hasani *et al.* to arrive at the claimed methods for identifying genes affecting glucose transport or genes involved in insulin-response diseases or disorders. In particular, Clancey relates to diagnostic and therapeutic methods for detecting and/or treating bone and cartilage formation and is wholey unrelated to the art of glucose transport.

The Office Action has failed to point to any teaching in the cited references which would impel one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of the references in order to arrive at the presently claimed invention. It is well-established law that the prior art must suggest "to those of ordinary skill in the art that they ***should*** make the claimed composition or device, or carry out the claimed process" and "[b]oth the suggestion and the reasonable expectation of success ***must be founded in the prior art, not in the applicant's disclosure*** (emphasis added)." *In re Dow Chemical Co.* 837 F.2d 469. 473, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1529, 1531 (Fed.Cir. 1988). Thus, absent evidence to the contrary, the combination of the two cited references amounts to an attempt at hindsight reconstruction of the claimed invention based on the teachings of Applicants' own specification and is clearly impermissible. See, for example, *In re Fine* 5

USPQ2d 1596 (Fed.Cir. 1988); *In re Gorman* 18 USPQ2d 1885 (Fed. Cir. 1991); *In re Fitch* 23 USPQ2d 1780 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

Even assuming arguendo that a skilled artisan might have been motivated to substitute siRNA for the plasmid DNA transfected in the Al-Hasani methodology, one would not have had a reasonable expectation that such a substitution would result in success. There are significant differences in the nature of siRNAs as compared to plasmid DNA, for example, the size, structure, stability, conformation, etc. A skilled artisan would have had an appreciation of these significant differences and would not have reasonably expected that mere substitution of siRNAs for the plasmid DNAs transfected in Al-Hasani would be successful.

Applicants describe in their specificaition the problems existing in the art at the time of the invention. In particular, Applicants teach in the specification on page 1, lines 23-24 that adipocyte "cells are difficult to work with and are not easily transfected with reagents that work in other cells such as fibroblasts." Furthermore, it was well known in the art at the time of the invention that the transfection of cells with DNA differs dramatically from the transfection of cells with siRNA, and that the transfection of siRNA varies greatly based on cell-type. For example, Walters and Jelinek[1] teach that the effectiveness of siRNAs may depend on the method of transfection (see title and abstract of Walters and Jelinek (2002) *Antisense and Nucleic Acid Drug Development* 12:411-418). More specifically, Walters and Jelinek teach the "striking dependence of dsRNA-mediated gene silencing in some cells on the methods of dsRNA transfection"(see Abstract of Walters and Jelinek). Additionally, Weil *et al.*[2] also teach that "the first difficulty with implementing RNA interference in a new cell type is optimizing the transfection procedure" (see page 1244, last paragraph of the Introduction, of Weil *et al.* (2002) *BioTechniques* 33:1244-1248).

These references indicate that, not only is the transfection of cells with siRNA different than transfection of cells with DNA, but siRNA transfection is complicated and the transfection procedure varies significantly from cell-type to cell-type. In summary, Applicants respectfully submit that the ordinarily skilled artisan at the time of Applicants' invention would not have reasonably expected to succeed in arriving at Applicants' invention based on the teachings of Al-Hasani *et al.* (J. Bio. Chem. 273(28):17504-17510, 1998) in view of Clancy *et al.* (US 20030087259).

[1] A copy of which is attached herein as Appendix A.
[2] A copy of which is attached herein as Appendix B.

In summary, Applicants respectfully submit that, contrary to the Examiner's assertions, the ordinarily skilled artisan at the time of Applicants' invention would not have been motivated nor have reasonably expected to succeed in arriving at Applicants' invention based on the teachings of Al-Hasani *et al.* (J. Bio. Chem. 273(28):17504-17510, 1998) in view of Clancy *et al.* (US 20030087259). For the foregoing reasons, rejection of the claimed invention is believed to be improper and Applicants respectfully request that it be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Rejection of claims 38-43 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Examiner has rejected claims 38-43 as being unpatentable over Al-Hasani *et al.* (J. Bio. Chem. 273(28):17504-17510, 1998) and Clancy *et al.* (US 20030087259) and further in view of Paquerequ *et al.* (Anal. Biochem. 204(1):147-151, 1992). The Examiner's comments with respect to Al-Hasani and Clancy are summarized above. The Office Action states, on page 8, that "Paquereau taught a method of delivering nucleic acids to mammalian cells by electroporation using a potential of 0.15-0.2kV and a capacitance of 960 micro F." In summary, the Office Action states that "[i]t would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to optimize the electrical potential and capacitance used in the electroporation of the cells of Al-Hasani because it was recognized in the art that these variables could affect the amount of cell damage caused by electroporation, as well as cellular survival after electroporation."

Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's assertion that the claimed invention would have been obvious to the skilled artisan at the time it was made. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

The currently pending claims are directed to a method of identifying a gene in an adipocyte that affects glucose transport or a gene involved in an insulin response disease or disorder.

The legal requirements to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness are set forth above. Applicants submit that the Examiner has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness since at the time the invention was made there was no motivation to combine the references in the manner suggested by the Examiner, nor was there a reasonable expectation of success in making the claimed invention. The teachings of Al-Hasani *et al.* and Clancy *et al.* are set forth above. As discussed previously, the Examiner has not provided the requisite motivation to combine these references. In addition, based on the teachings of the references, there was no

reasonable expectation of success in making the claimed invention based on the teachings of these references.

The Paquereau reference does not teach or suggest the claimed invention either alone or in combination with the Al-Hasani and Clancy references. Paquereau describes the transfection of ***hepatocyte cells with DNA*** (see e.g., page 148, column 2, lines 1-4 of Paquereau *et al.*). In particular, Paquereau describes the electroporation of high concentrations of isolated hepatocytes (*e.g.*, 16-20 x 10^6 heaptocites, *i.e.*, 20-25 x 10^6 hepatocytes per 0.8 ml) with large amounts of plasmid DNA (*e.g.*, 30 μg DNA per 0.8ml) in the presence of large amounts of carrier DNA (*e.g.*, 400 um). The transfection methods are optimized to obtain high levels of expression of the reporter gene CAT. As discussed previously, siRNAs and plasmid DNA are quite different chemical entities. Accordingly, one of skill in the art at the time of the instant invention would not have not had a reasonable expectation of success in utilizing certain of the parameters disclosed in Paquereau for transfection of large amounts of plasmid DNA to arrive at the siRNA electroporation methods featured in the claimed invention based upon this teaching, nor would one be motivated to combine these references. Moreover, there is nothing in Paquereau *et al.* which would motivate a skilled artisan to combine the teachings with those of Al-Hasani *et al.* and Clancey *et al.* to arrive at the claimed methods for identifying genes affecting glucose transport or genes involved in insulin-response diseases or disorders. Paquereau *et al.* relates to DNA transfection of hepatocytes to preserve a growth hormone response and is wholey unrelated to the art of glucose transport.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that, contrary to the Examiner's assertions, the ordinarily skilled artisan at the time of Applicants' invention would not have been motivated nor have reasonably expected to succeed in arriving at Applicants' invention based on the teachings of Al-Hasani *et al.* (J. Bio. Chem. 273(28):17504-17510, 1998) and Clancy *et al.* (US 20030087259) and further in view of Paquerequ *et al.* (Anal. Biochem. 204(1):147-151, 1992). Therefore, the claimed invention is not obvious in view of the cited art. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claims 38-43 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) and favorable reconsideration.

Rejection of claim 49 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Examiner has rejected claim 49 as being unpatentable over Al-Hasani *et al.* (J. Bio. Chem. 273(28):17504-17510, 1998) and Clancy *et al.* (US 20030087259) and further in view of

Standaert *et al.* (J. Biol. Chem. 272(48):30075-30082, 1997). The Examiner's comments with respect to Al-Hasani and Clancy are summarized above. The Examiner states on page 9 of the Office Action that, "Standaert taught methods of studying the effect of a gene expression of protein kinase C zeta (PKC-zeta) on glucose transport." The Office Action summarizes, on page 10, that "[i]t would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to extend the studies of Al-Hasani to studies of glucose uptake."

Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's assertion that the claimed invention would have been obvious to the skilled artisan at the time it was made. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

The currently pending claims are directed to a method of identifying a gene that affects glucose transport or a gene involved in an insulin response disease or disorder.

The legal requirements to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness are set forth above. Applicants submit that the Examiner has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness since at the time the invention was made there was no motivation to combine the references in the manner suggested by the Examiner, nor was there a reasonable expectation of success in making the claimed invention. The teachings of Al-Hasani *et al.* and Clancy *et al.* are set forth above. As discussed previously, the Examiner has not provided the requisite motivation to combine these references. In addition, based on the teachings of the references, there was no reasonable expectation of success in making the claimed invention based on the teachings of these references.

The Standaert reference does not teach or suggest the claimed invention either alone or in combination with the Al-Hasani and Clancy references. Standaert, like Al-Hasani, is directed toward the study of insulin stimulation in glucose transport by transfection of ***rat adipocytes with plasmid DNA*** (see *e.g.*, page 148, column 2, lines 1-4 of Standaert *et al.*). Like Al-Hasani, Standaert fails to rectify the deficiency of teaching of features necessary to electroporation of siRNAs as in the claimed invention. Applicants submit that one of skill in the art at the time of the instant invention would not have not had a reasonable expectation of success in making the claimed invention based upon this teaching, nor would one be motivated to combine these references.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that, contrary to the Examiner's assertions, the ordinarily skilled artisan at the time of Applicants' invention would not have been motivated nor have reasonably expected to succeed in arriving at Applicants' invention based on

the teachings of Al-Hasani *et al.* (J. Bio. Chem. 273(28):17504-17510, 1998) and Clancy *et al.* (US 20030087259) and further in view of Standaert *et al.* (J. Biol. Chem. 272(48):30075-30082, 1997). Therefore, the claimed invention is not obvious in view of the cited art. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claim 49 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) and favorable reconsideration.

Rejection of claim 52 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Examiner has rejected claim 52 as being unpatentable over Al-Hasani *et al.* (J. Bio. Chem. 273(28):17504-17510, 1998) and Clancy *et al.* (US 20030087259) and further in view of McSwiggen *et al.* (US Patent 7,022,828). The Examiner states on page 10 of the Office Action that, "[t]he teachings of Al-Hasani and Clancy... can be combined to render obvious methods of identifying a gene that affects glucose transport by assaying insulin-mediated GLUT4 translocation in the presence or absence of dynamin, wherein dynamin concentration is modulated through siRNA delivered by electroporation." Further, on page 11, the Office Action states that "McSwiggen taught methods of inhibiting gene expression using siRNA, and taught that the stability of siRNA molecules could be enhanced through the use of modified bases." In conclusion, the Office Action summarizes that "[i]t would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use modified siRNA oligonucleotides in the invention of Al-Hasani as modified by Clancy... in order to enhance the function of the oligonucleotides, as taught by McSwiggen."

Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's assertion that the claimed invention would have been obvious to the skilled artisan at the time it was made. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

The McSwiggen reference does not teach or suggest the claimed invention either alone or in combination with the Al-Hasani and Clancy references. McSwiggen teaches modified siRNA oligonucleotides which modulate the expression or function of IKK genes, such as IKK-gamma, IKK-alpha, or IKK-beta, and PKR genes in several cell types. However, McSwiggen does disclose any details of transfecting ***adipocytes*** with siRNA. Thus, McSwiggen fails to rectify the deficiency of teaching of the Al-Hasani and Clancy references. Moreover, there is nothing in McSwiggen which would motivate a skilled artisan to combine the teachings with those of Al-Hasani *et al.* and Clancey *et al.* to arrive at the claimed methods for identifying genes affecting glucose transport or genes involved in insulin-response diseases or disorders. McSwiggen

relates generically to the chemistry of siRNA derivatives and is wholey unrelated to the art of glucose transport.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that, contrary to the Examiner's assertions, the ordinarily skilled artisan at the time of Applicants' invention would not have been motivated nor have reasonably expected to succeed in arriving at Applicants' invention based on the teachings of Al-Hasani *et al.* (J. Bio. Chem. 273(28):17504-17510, 1998) and Clancy *et al.* (US 20030087259) and further in view of McSwiggen *et al.* (US Patent 7,022,828). Therefore, the claimed invention is not obvious in view of the cited art. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claim 52 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) and favorable reconsideration.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, entry of the amendments and remarks presented, favorable reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections, and allowance of this application with the pending claim are respectfully requested. If a telephone conversation with the Applicant's attorney would expedite prosecution of the above-identified application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at (617) 227-7400.

Dated: December 12, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By _____
Debra J. Milasincic
Registration No.: 46,931
LAHIVE & COCKFIELD, LLP
One Post Office Square
Boston, Massachusetts 02109
(617) 227-7400
(617) 742-4214 (Fax)
Attorney/Agent For Applicant